DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 927 CS 208 832

AUTHOR Salerno, Douglas
TITLE Implications of Cognitive Complexity Research on the Teaching of Perspective-Taking in Writing Courses.
PUB DATE 22 Mar 85
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (36th, Minneapolis, MN, March 21-23, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Assignments; *Audience Analysis; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Perspective Taking; *Persuasive Discourse; *Student Participation; Teaching Methods; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Awareness

ABSTRACT

The addition of an interpersonal element to the rhetorical devices offered students as they learn how to construct persuasive messages can enhance their writing by helping students discover why they produce the writing they do. To do so, teachers must help students to become more sensitive to the audience and involve them more in the "construction" of an audience for their assignments. This can be accomplished by having students construct a plausible problem situation that necessitates a letter (or essay). They specify an audience for their assignment and a specific purpose they hope to achieve with their writing. When they complete this preliminary assignment, they have created a "case study," which the teacher evaluates, grading primarily on thoroughness of the problem formulation. After receiving the teacher's comments, the students complete their own assignment. If a buffer is necessary, if "space" is needed to put the reader in a frame of mind conducive to accepting a negative message, students are allowed to decide on the nature of the buffer. Once the assignment is completed, it is evaluated on the basis of information presented in the case study. (Appendixes include model audience analysis profiles and a sample case study.) (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED255927

IMPLICATIONS OF COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY RESEARCH ON THE TEACHING OF PERSPECTIVE-TAKING IN WRITING COURSES

By Douglas Salerno
English/Writing Department
Washtenaw Community College
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Conference on College Composition and Communication
Minneapolis, MN
March 22, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Douglas Salerno

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 208 832

Implications of Cognitive Complexity Research
on the Teaching of Perspective-Taking in Writing Courses

We often approach persuasive writing from a purely rhetorical perspective. That is, we consider the various devices which will best illustrate and support our own position. Such devices may include logical reasoning, emotional appeals and attempts to bolster our own credibility as a knowledgeable and trustworthy writer. Our awareness of our audience may be subordinate to our concern for expressing our position clearly and convincingly. Most writing textbooks encourage this approach to persuasive writing, be it an argumentative essay or a business refusal letter. Particularly in cases where we face readers who are antagonistic or unreceptive to our viewpoint, position or objectives, textbooks usually rely upon preconceived formulas rather than situationally-based strategies for achieving effective results. Thus, for example, the refusal letter is taught as a series of formulaic "parts" (buffer, reasoning, refusal, goodwill closing) which respond to a reader who is or shortly will become hostile to the ideas expressed in the letter. When an audience is considered in most expository and persuasive writing, emphasis usually highlights such cognitive concerns as vocabulary level, amount of information appropriate/relevant and such stylistic concerns as sentence formation and paragraph development. Occasionally, organization may be treated from a rhetorical perspective (eg., use of the inductive approach may soften the negative response to a controversial stance).

While these rhetorical concerns are important and certainly must be attended to, I would like to suggest that we may enhance our writing instruction by considering some recent research in the human

communication field on interpersonal relationships. I want to examine the ways in which writing a persuasive letter or essay to a hostile audience may be viewed similarly to those times when we need to repair or construct interpersonal bridges face-to-face with another person. Thus I would like to add an interpersonal element to the traditional rhetorical devices offered students as they learn how to construct persuasive messages.

Until very recently, almost all writing instruction had as its central aim the clear presentation of information and ideas from the writer to some (usually undefined) audience. The entire writing process, from pre-writing inventional heuristics through editing and proofreading, had as its central aim the production of well ordered, clearly stated prose. We now are witnessing a broadening of concerns to include the audience.

If we accept that writing occurs in a context, with a specific audience either invoked or addressed, (Ede and Lunsford, 1984), and that such writing has a specific purpose, then our reliance on formulas (cover letters, refusal letters, argumentative essays) must be reviewed. To date, almost all writing instruction, regardless of the philosophical or pedagogical basis from which it springs, is grounded in genre/formula. We "teach" these genres/ formulas not as though they were some arbitrary catalog of writing products but as if they defined the only way thought could be put on paper. Product-entered prose concerns itself with attention to formula and robs both writer and reader of the potential to see old problems in new ways. More recently, there has been a move to situationally-based prose. For many, however, this has been merely rerobing the wolf in different garb. The "case study," for example, often substitutes an <u>explicit</u> call to produce a product with an <u>implicit</u> call to produce the same product. For example, rather than say, "write a refusal

letter for tomorrow" we create an elaborate scenario which "requires a refusal letter due tomorrow." We have provided the student with more context specific information but we still control the student writer's audience.

Let's examine one small facet of writing instruction, teaching students how to write effective buffers. Instruction in writing buffers assumes a concern for audience and audience analysis. This concern, in turn, presupposes that writers can shape their language in specific ways to reach their readers and, most importantly, that all readers are not the same. Yet when textbook writers talk about audience analysis they often assume that their student readers already have mastered this difficult skill. Myra Kogen (1983), for example, notes that most textbooks treat the writer's relationship to audience "in peripheral introductory chapters that describe audience contact in terms of sender-message-receiver models largely borrowed from oral communication" (p. 2). She elaborates two "paths" that current research on audience is taking. The first path conceptualizes audience as a "real" person or group of people. We "analyze" this audience by gathering information about them. Such a viewpoint encourages us to "identify the kinds of audiences for which a work is intended so that discourse can be shaped to the needs of particular readers" (ibid.). Thus we try to shape the message to take into account the needs, attitudes and other pertinent background information of that specific group of readers. We probably will construct a different message for a group of conservative, middle aged women than for an audience of liberal, young women, for example; messages to friendly audiences will differ from messages to hostile or indifferent audiences.

An alternate concept creats audience as a "fiction." Walter Ong

(1975) typifies this research path. Because we can never entirely "know" our audience completely, he says, we "create" those aspects that are missing from our knowledge of our reader. We encourage our reader to "assume a stance" with us. Assuming the dual roles of playwright and principal actor, we feed our audience "cues" as to how we expect them to react to our "lines." For example, in writing a letter attempting to regain the goodwill of a present customer who has suffered poor service from our organization, we may "create" a reader who is good natured, forgiving and willing to give us another chance. Thus, rather than "bombarding" our reader with logic and good reasons as to why they should "give us another chance," we create a situation with our fictive audience which allows them to persuade themselves.

Little of the preceding research is addressed in current textbooks which assume that students need only consider certain demographical information and they automatically will be able to address an effective piece of communication to their audience. Thus student writers, and even their counterparts in the business world, often use the buffer in a manner which is mechanical and obvious, sometimes even exacerbating the very problem they are trying to ameliorate!

Much writing on the buffer is ineffective because some of the information presented is just plain wrong. Textbook writers usually assume that all bad-news communication requires some kind of buffer and/or indirect way of presenting the negative message. For example, Brown (1982) warns: "Readers never want to hear 'no' in a letter, for they desire and expect a 'yes' answer to a request. For this reason, never begin the 'no' letter with the refusal" (p. 78). Hatch (1983), however, advises: "not all refusals are likely to upset the reader. Sometimes requests reflect only

casual interest; other times people ask for something simply to see whether or not it's available...Quite frankly, using the bad-news strategy isn't always worth the effort, even when you know the message will arouse feelings of disappointment" (pp. 242-243).

Presentations of the buffer often depict the writing situation as an adversarial one between writer and reader. Students are advised to "be positive" or "don't be so bluntly negative" in constructing the opening paragraph. Given the tenor of this writing problem, it is no wonder that students develop a cynical view of the entire communication process. Such teaching merely affirms what many students and other practitioners already believe: that effective persuasive writng is manipulative, that it isn't what you say--and especially it isn't why you say it--but most importantly how you say it that matters. Style over substance. Besides breeding cynicism, such a teaching approach at best reinforces a wrong view of communication (mechanistic, manipulative) and at worst trivializes the complicated cognitive, social and ethical decisions that go into the formation of a piece of persuasive writing.

Let's examine one kind of negative news message with which almost all of us are familiar: the job refusal letter. To begin, we need to consider two important points: the context in which the letter is written and the audience's perspective in reading the letter. Most experienced job seekers soon realize that the arrival of a written response to a job application letter almost certainly means bad news. Employers typically use the telephone to communicate job offers and employment interviews; they use the mail to send the rejection notices. In most cases, then, the letter reader is expecting "negative news" even before opening the envelope. Thus a "beating around the bush" buffer may intensify the ill will we are trying

to avoid in the reader. The sheer number of refusal letters that our reader may have received makes our job all the more difficult. The potency of a stock buffer is severely diminished after the reader has read a half dozen or so refusal letters. The reader soon comes to appreciate, even anticipate, the generic formula: buffer, rejection, reason, goodwill closing. For many readers, then, the refusal letter can lose most of its effectiveness and become instead merely a ritualistic device, similar to welcoming greetings co-workers give each other at the office.

To illustrate my point, I would like to share the results of an analysis of twenty-two rejection letters I received in the last six months of 1983. The letters came both from academia and private industry and were in response to a variety of jobs advertised for which I sent a job application letter. Eight of the letters contained no buffer at all. In two cases the writer emphasized the bad news by beginning with "I am sorry to inform you..." or "It is my unpleasant duty..." The other six letters began without any social amneity, merely stated the result of their job search. Four such letters began: "We have now come to the point..."; "I write to tell you that..."; "We have received your inquiry..."; and "We have at last finished..." Eight other letters contained a buffer but presented the bad news closely afterwards, diminishing the buffer's effect. Typically the letter began with "Thank you" and then in the same sentence or in the very next sentence used language such as "however," "but," "unfortunately," "I regret," "we regret, however" and "I am sorry to tell you." In these cases, the letter writer seemed to regard the buffer as a mere formality, as ritualistic language. Readers would be likely to miss the intended buffer completely because of the proximity of the negative news.

Finally, six letters contained at least a full-sentence buffer and a "bridge" between the opening paragraph and the bad news. The writer usually used several paragraphs to explain the selection process. In some cases, the name of the appointed person was given. In all cases, the writer closed by repeating some part of the buffer, usually the "thank you," and wished the reader well ("good luck") in the job search. Two letters stand out as being particularly well crafted. The first message was typed on a postcard and consisted of only two sentences: "We have at last finished our review of applications and have filled the position in our department. Thank you for applying." The second letter began "We are most happy to announce that [name of appointee] has accepted a position..." The first letter's effectiveness is contained in its brevity. The letter writer, perhaps realizing the ineffectiveness of a letter easily recognizable as belonging to the "refusal genre," finesses the expected refusal by allowing the reader to infer that "I did not get the job." Such a tactic removes the necessity of the almost always awkward (and insincere) language extolling the reader's virtues and merits. The tone and brevity confirm a reasonably friendly, humane refusal. The second letter also catches the jaded refusal letter reader by surprise. As in the first case, the writer spares the reader a direct refusal and instead allows the reader to infer the bad news.

Given the above, we might want to rethink the notion that all bad news messages necessarily require a buffer. Particularly when our readers expect to receive bad news, they may interpret the buffer as either insincere or merely ritualistic, neither response being what we want. Certainly there are other kinds of business communication where the telephone is used to communicate compliance and where a letter conveys a

refusal. In these cases, the buffer may be irrelevant, even counterproductive in maintaining good will.

There are many situations, however, when a reader opens a letter and either does not know what to expect or has optimistic expectations. In these situations, a well-written buffer can prepared the reader for refusal. However, the writer will need to be sensitive to the reader's expectations and motivation for making the request and the likely response to the refusal (anger, disappointment, resignation) and the reader's "next step" as a consequence of receiving the refusal (litigation, another letter, withdrawal of business). In writing a letter, we behave in ways similar to facing an interpersonal exchange, viewing the letter not from a one-way perspective, but anticipating the interior state of our audience and their likely response to certain strategies.

I would like, then, to present an interpersonal writing approach. My perspective presupposes that writing instruction and evaluation should concern itself not only with the product, the what that students produce, but also the process, trying to discover why students produce the writing they do. For example did they complete a business letter assignment merely by copying some format outlined on the blackboard, did they copy it from a book "1001 Models of Effective Business Communication" or did they actually sit down, analyze the situation and audience and then attempt a specific response to it. Cognitive complexity research generally is recognized as beginning with the work of psychologist George Kelly (1955) who argued that people's processes are "psychologically channelized by the ways in which [they] anticipate events" (1963:46). As Michael Beatty and Steven Payne (1984) have noted, most cognitive complexity research rests on the notion that individuals differ in the number and kinds of "personal constructs" or

"lenses" they use to view and anticipate events and process information (p. 208). Jesse Delia and Barbara O'Keefe define constructs as "organized schemas or patterns of expectation within which events are construed or interpreted. "Any event," they argue, "can make sense only in so far as it is ordered within the construct system" (unpb:5) Researchers typically measure cognitive complexity by having subjects write descriptions of two persons they know, one they like and one they dislike. Researchers then count the number of different ways subjects describe the two people. Cognitive complexity can be viewed as a continuum of information processing ability, specifically information about people. According to research summarized by Beatty and Payne, the lower end of the continuum includes "categorical thinking, rapid closure and simple and absolute rules for combining constructs whereas abstract, continuous, probabilistic thinking, complex and flexible combinatory rules and suspension of closure are indicative of the higher end of the continuum" (p. 209). Researchers argue that cognitive complexity measures are different from measures of intelligence or verbal acuity, and that this skill is developmental, increasing with chronological age.

Perspective taking describes "the ability of a person to represent another's perspective or point of view: (O'Keefe and Sypher, 1981:81). Research with children and adolescents conducted by Delia, Clark and others suggests at least three levels of perspective taking. At the lowest level, subjects give no evidence of perspective taking at all. Persuasive strategies constructed at this level are entirely centered within the perspective of the persuader. At level two, subjects acknowledge that their audience does not share their opinion, but subjects provide arguments which support only their own viewpoint. At level three, subjects not only

are able to anticipate objections but also provide counter-arguments in messages to their audience. While statistical analyses of cognitive complexity and social perspective taking results have not provided researchers with a unanimous conclusion regarding the correlation between these two measures, O'Keefe and Sypher (pp. 81-82) suggest such a relationship. Finally, several studies (O'Keefe and Sypher; Hale, 1980; O'Keefe and Delia, 1979; Delia, Kline and Burleson, 1979; Delia, Clark and Switzer, 1979) conclude that there is a positive correlation between cognitive complexity and communication effectiveness. As O'Keefe and Sypher argue in their critical review of cognitive complexity research, this measure has "important consequences" for the kinds of communicative strategies, rationales and number of persuasive arguments used by individuals in persuasive encounters with their audiences (pp. 85-86).

If we want our students to become more sensitive to audience, then we must involve them more in the "construction" of an audience for their assignments. Ultimately, then, this means that we must give our students more control over the audience they construct for their assignments. Having students write for or to their writing instructors presents two problems. First, such a situation allows the student only a narrow range of possibilities for addressing an audience. It's like an athletic team playing the same opponent for the entire season. After awhile, the endeavor becomes predictable and tiring. Second, such a situation often forces the student to accomodate unarticulated rules and expectations and to accept criticism which may explicitly address reasonable issues but implicitly communicate only a single reader's idiosyncratic notions of good writing. For example, the instructor's comment "you need to include more arguments from a variety of sources" may merely reflect the instructor/

reader's own personal preference for particular arguments or sources. A curt "too blunt" written next to the refusal paragraph may merely convey the reader's personal preference for a more indirect refusal. The central question then becomes: who owns the audience? By allowing the student not only to address the audience but also to create it, we come closer to approximating "real world" situations which often require us not only to search out a viewpoint but also to find/create an audience to listen to that viewpoint. Such a scheme also saves countless hours of haggling over stylistics which may often boil down to personal preference. In response to the instructor's comment "Your conclusion needs more support," the student may rightfully argue "The audience I had in mind for this paper would not require such an elaborately argued conclusion."

The teaching strategy I use to present effective writing allows students to construct their own writing assignments and is closely modeled after the work of Roundy and Thralls (1983). My students construct a plausible problem situation which necessitates a letter (or essay). They specify an audience for their assignment and a specific purpose they hope to achieve with their writing. When they have completed this preliminary assignment, they have created a "case study" for their assignment. I evaluate their case study, grading primarily on thoroughness of formulating the problem. Then, after receiving my comments on their case study, they complete their own assignment. I evaluate that assignment on the basis of information presented in their case study. My methodology assumes that no one knows the audience better than the writer. Therefore, I can best evaluate someone's writing by looking over their shoulder, by having the student inform me of the specifics (problem, audience, purpose) of the

particular writing context. For example, the student may create a reader who likes his or her messages "straight and to the point." I let the student decide that. If a buffer is necessary, if "space" is needed to put the reader in a mindframe conducive to accepting a negative message, I let the student decide on the nature of the buffer. Thus a "thank you for your request" may be an appropriate buffer not because it "beats around the bush" but because it is something the writer has decided that his or her reader expects in a busines letter, or because the reader will want some acknowledgement of his or her letter before receiving a reply. Thus I am just as interested in my students' writing strategies as I am in the content of their message.

References

Beatty, M. and Payne, S. Loquacity and quantity of constructs as predictors of social perspective-taking. Communication Quarterly, 32 (Summer 1984) 208.

Brown, L. Communicating Facts and Ideas in Business, 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Delia, J. and O'Keefe, B. Constructivism and communicative development. Unpublished manuscript, n.d.

Delia, J., Kline, S. and Burleson, B. The development of persuasive communication strategies in kindergarteners through twelfth graders. Communication Monographs, 46 (November 1979) 254-256.

Delia, J., Clark, R. and Switzer, D. The content of informal conversations as a function of interactants' interpersonal cognitive complexity. Communication Monographs, 46 (November 1979) 280-281.

Ede, L. and Lunsford, A. Audience addressed/audience invoked: the role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. College Composition and Communication, 30 (May 1984) 155-171.

Hale, C. Cognitive complexity-simplicity as a determinant of communication effectiveness. Communication Monographs, 47 (November 1980) 304-311.

Hatch, R. Business Communication: Theory and Technique. Chicago: SRA, 1983.

Kelly, G. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. 2 vols. New York: Norton, 1955.

Kelly, G. A Theory of personality: The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton, 1963.

Kogen, M. The role of audience in business and technical writing. The American Business Communication Association Bulletin, 46 (December 1983), 2.

Kroll, B. Writing for readers: three perspectives on audience. College Composition and Communication, 30 (May 1984), 172-185.

O'Keefe, B. and Delia, J. Construct comprehensiveness and cognitive complexity as predictors of the number and strategic adaptation of arguments and appeals in a persuasive message. Communication Monographs, 46 (November 1979), 230-240.

O'Keefe, D. and Sypher, H. Cognitive complexity measures and the relationship of cognitive complexity to communication. Human Communication Research, 8 (Fall 1981) 72-92.

Ong, W. The writer's audience is always a fiction. PMLA, 90 (1975), 247-257.

Roundy, N. and Thralls, C. Modeling the communication context: a procedure for revision and evaluation in business writing. The Journal of Business Communcation, 20 (Summer 1983), 27-46.

Rutkoskie, A. and Murphree, C. Effective Writing for Business. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1983.

APPENDIX A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

<<MODEL>>

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS PROFILE

1. What is the problem/issue that you wish to address in this paper?

Local High School is faced with an $80,000 budget deficit. Several members of the district's Board of Education have suggested that the high school varsity football program be eliminated to resolve the problem. They argue that the elimination of the program would save other curricular and extra-curricular programs. Supporters of the football program have organized and publicized their side of the issue. They argue that the football program should not be cut.

2. Who is your audience? (Relevant demographics--age, occupation, interest, background. Please avoid "the general public," "all those interested in my topic," "all people my age" as they are not helpful parameters.)

Players, fans, parents and friends of Local High School football program. Most of my readers have attended LHS varsity football games for at least five years. They are active in the program (players, cheerleaders, Booster Club, Band Club, Parents Athletic Committee).

3. What does my audience already believe about this subject? How strong (intensity) are their feelings?

My readers believe very strongly in the program. They feel that the LHS football program unites the school as well as the community. The parents feel that the program is a worthwhile activity for their sons and daughters, that it helps them in their physical and social development and that it absorbs energy that might otherwise be used in less constructive ways (eg., delinquency, drugs).

4. What does my audience already know about the subject? What information will they need to know?

My readers already know that the school budget must be cut by $80,000, which is the approximate cost of the football program. They may not realize that the program has barely broken even--two of the last three years the program lost money ($2,500 in 1981; $1,700 in 1983). My audience will need to know of these deficits. They also need to realize that the football program only involves 155 students (out of 2,300), that the money saved by cutting the program could be used for more students in more programs (eg. drama, 75; political science club, 50; computer club, 125; ecology club, 30; orchestra, 195).

5. What does my audience value? How are their values different from mine?

My readers value the benefits of competitive athletics which they view as character-building, community uniting and energy-absorbing. Without football, many of my readers would be hard pressed to find

something to do during the late summer-early fall. My audience also values the tradition surrounding LHS football. Many parents (dads) of current players were on the 1961 state championship team. Although in recent years the team has compiled a 20-16 record, during the early sixties and again in the mid seventies, the team won several state and league titles. Two players during the last 20 years have earned All America honors at major universities and one former player is now a starting running back on an NFL team.

My values differ from those of my readers in three important ways. First, I believe that the "greater good" should be considered in a time of resources reduction. Programs that benefit more students should be favored over programs that benefit relatively fewer students. Second, competitive sports do not have the importance in my value system as non-competitive endeavors. Finally, I place higher value on life-long activities/development rather than on short-term activities. Football is a relatively short-lived skill; running, drama, political science can and are life-long interests that will continue to allow participants to enjoy themselves and grow as individuals.

6. What common assumptions do I share with my audience? Where is the common ground? What reasons can I offer to support my claim that they also will find attractive?

Both my audience and I agree that the physical and social development of young people is critically important. We both recognize the problems that can arise when young people have "extra time" on their hands. I also acknowledge my readers' concerns for a drug problem in the schools. We also share a concern for doing what is best for the school and the community. Many of the students who participate in football also participate in other school activities which would have to be cut if the football program was allowed to continue. I could use this fact as a possible attractive argument to support my claim. Maybe I could try to persuade my readers that students would enjoy longer benefits from these other activities (orchestra, drama, etc.) than they would from football. Also, I could present my plan as a <u>temporary</u> measure, necessary only as long as the school district's financial situation remains unhealthy. If an additional tax measure was approved, then I would support the reinstatement of the football program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Speech 101
Mr. Salerno

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS PROFILE

1. **What is the problem/issue?**

An issue that will come before the Ann Arbor School Board probably in the spring is the need to explore potential elementary school closings due to low enrollment in these individual schools and the high cost of maintaining the staff and buildings.

Supporters of this issue cite budget constraints due to the recent millage defeat and potentially inferior education due to lack of programs in these schools. Supporters wish to assign these students to larger schools further away from their neighborhoods. In some cases this would involve busing. Indirect supporters of these potential school closings and resultant money savings may be those individuals currently paying school property taxes who do not have children or no longer have children in school. Additionally, parents of children paying private school tuitions could be indirect supporters of these school closings.

Opponents cite loss of the neighborhood school concept. Children who live in the same area and play together might not necessarily go to the same school. This may negatively impact their peer relationships. The school as a neighborhood meeting place for community and special activities would cease to exist in those affected neighborhoods. Property value would be lowered due to the lack of a neighborhood elementary school facility. Opponents do not agree that the education is inferior, citing the lower student-teacher ratio results in more individualized attention per student. Parents in the potentially affected school areas oppose busing and are additionally concerned with the safety of their small children. Opponents also point out that the School Board is an elected body that has the responsibility to reflect and act upon the directives of the community that placed them in their positions.

2. **Who is the audience?**

The Ann Arbor School Board. This is an educated, articulate group of individuals consisting of 9 people, 5 women and 4 men. This group is a mixture of liberal and conservative views with 5 Republicans and 4 Democrats. Seven are property owners and 6 have children. A number of them have strong educational basis. Ages and occupations vary.

3. **What does my audience already believe about this subject? How strong are their feelings?**

The audience is aware that this is a highly charged, sensitive issue with strong opposition from parents whose children attend the two or three schools which may be closed. Publicly, they are likely to express understanding, sympathy, and support for the opponents' viewpoints. However, privately they may strongly feel that there is no realistic solution to the budget difficulties except to close schools and consolidate resources. I believe that they recognize their political future could hinge on their vote. There are also members of the audience who ardently spoke against the school closings last year and would bring their arguments to the forefront this spring.

4. **What does my audience already know about the subject? What information will they need to know?**

I need to recognize that they have far more detailed information on this subject than I do. (Present and projected budget constraints, school enrollment projections, operating costs, program costs, achievement test scores per school, long range goals for the school district, anticipated millage requests). They are aware of the opposition by parents in the projected areas and of the teachers opposition to higher student-teacher ratios. They have access to reports outlining the cost savings gained through the school closings.

The School Board needs to know that there is a broader base of opposition among constituents that goes beyond neighborhoods surrounding potentially affected schools. It extends to those of us parents in other elementary school areas who do not wish to see our current school population swell to uncomfortably high levels as we absorb the displaced students.

(1) Higher student-teacher ratios will negatively impact my children's education.

(2) Overcrowding will lead to discipline problems and will promote spread of communicable diseases.

(3) Resources of any one school will have to be shared by more, thereby decreasing the quantity and quality available to the individual student. The Board also needs to know that I, as one voter, value quality education to the extent that I will support a millage increase to maintain that quality.

5. **What does my audience value? How are their values different from mine?**

The audience is concerned with a cost effective, efficient school system. They value the quality of children's education and some place high value on the neighborhood school concept. I agree with the above values, but place my emphasis on quality education within the neighborhood school system and then secondly, value a cost effective system.

6. **What common assumptions do I share with my audience? Where is the common ground? What reasons can I offer to support my claim that they also will find attractive?**

We all want the children to receive a quality education. We all would like to get the best education possible for the money. I could suggest to the Board the following cost saving or money making measures:

(1) Broaden the TLC (Teaching Learning Community) programs to as many schools as possible, using the volunteer grandparents in more of a variety of roles.

(2) Seek parent volunteers to work as lunchroom monitors by rotating responsibilities.

(3) Seek out older students to volunteer as periodic teacher aides, lunch room, playground monitors, office assistants.

(4) Assess available space in different schools and rent out space to city departments and programs such as parks and recreation and the public library.

(5) Provide rental space to civic organizations and community groups.

(6) Consider renting some athletic facilities to private groups or businesses.

(7) Consider renting meeting facilities to private groups or businesses. Since some schools are concerned with traffic and public access, perhaps some of these rentals could be considered in the evening when school is not in session or even weekends.

(8) One program that is not currently available but may be highly welcomed by a community with so many working families is day care arrangements, particularly before and after school. The program could be funded and administered by private licensed day care individuals or groups of community co-ops and would rent space in the schools. These groups could then seek use particularly, but not necessarily exclusively, by families within that neighborhood and school area.

(9) The School Board should consider and seek out active use of these buildings during the summer months instead of allowing these buildings to see minimal use for over 2 months out of the year.

(10) Programs that cannot sustain a full time teacher can perhaps be serviced by one teacher assigned to several schools such as physical education, art and music.

Appendix C

WHAT IT IS LIKE FOR A SMOKER

Cheryl C
English Composition 122
Section 007
January 31, 1985
Mr. Salerno

Assignment #1
Case Study

I. The Situation

A. Problem

Nonsmokers demand their right to breathe a smoke free atmosphere. This is their right, but it is also the smokers right to smoke if they want. In the non-smokers fight to have the right to breathe a smoke free atmosphere the smokers right to smoke is in danger of being violated in ways.

Also the nonsmoker doesn't understand the smokers addiction. They can't understand why the smoker can't just lay the pack down and quit.

B. Previous contact with reader (or reader's previous contact with the problem.)

The reader doesn't understand why the smoker continues such an unhealthy habit forcing the nonsmoker to breathe their cigarette smoke. The reader has been in the situation of having to breath someones cigarette smoke, either in a restaurant, school hallways, or lounge.

II. The Audience

A. Identification

The audience is someone who has never smoked. They may have tried maybe one or two cigarettes but have never really smoked on a regular basis and experienced what it is like to go without this addictive habit.

The audience is not compromising in the least when it comes to breathing someone's cigarette smoke. They may even get rude to the point of making motions with their hands, facial expressions, wearing non-smoking buttons, to faking coughs.

B. Characterization

1. Factual

a. Education/training.

The working adult and college student. Possibly both, working and attending school.

b. Background on problem situation

The reader is someone who knows a smoker and would like to see them quit because they are concerned about their health but doesn't understand what it is like for them to try and quit or go without cigarettes. They think the smoker can just quit without any problems. The reader is also someone who might live with a smoker and doesn't like breathing the cigarette smoke, or has a family member who visits and smokes while they are there.

2. Psychological

a. Reader's questions/needs/interests

The reader wants to know why a smoker continues to indulge in such a nasty and disgusting habit. Also, why can't the smoker just quit, especially if the smoker wants to. The reader might also want to know why the smoker insists on smoking every opportunity they can like it is life or death. and why they insist on smoking.

b. Readers' unique concerns

The reader has the unique concern of not understanding what it is like for a smoker to experience going without a cigarette.

c. Reader's likely response to my paper

The reader will probably still demand their nonsmoking areas which is good but hopefully they will be a little more tolerant of the smoker. They will most likely not object to the smoker having a place to smoke as long as it does not interfere with their nonsmoking areas.

II. Purposes and Uses of the Message

A. Purposes

1. Primary

The primary purpose of my paper is to show that the smoker has rights as well as the nonsmoker. The smoker's right to smoke and the nosmoker's right not to smoke.

2. Secondary

The secondary purpose of my paper is to try and show the nonsmoker what it is like for the smoker to go without smoking.

B. Uses

1. Primary

The primary use of my paper is that I hope to show the reader what it is like for the smoker so that the nonsmoker can better understand the situation and understand also the need for the smoker to have a place to smoke.

2. Secondary

The secondary use of my paper is that given the reader what it is like for the smoker trying to quit or going long periods of time without a cigarette that the nonsmoker may be able to be more tolerant of the smoker and respect the smokers right to smoke.

What It Is Like For A Smoker

I grew up in a family of nonsmokers and every time a smoker would visit they would smoke in our house. The smell that lingered after they left was so irritating and stomach turning my mom and I could not sleep that night. Mom has always despised the smell and smoke of cigarettes. She would go around opening windows and fussing for two or three days after someone smoked in the house. Even if the smell had been gone since the day before she would complain like they had just smoked in the house an hour ago. I hated cigarettes just as badly as she did. I got angry because she allowed people to smoke in the house. I just couldn't understand why she wouldn't tell them that smoking in the house wasn't allowed. It seemed to me that they could visit without having to smoke for that length of time. Really, I couldn't understand why anyone would want to smoke at all. Why didn't they just quit? Everyone who smoked was always saying they wanted to quit.

Well, now that I am a two-pack a day nicotine addict I know why they smoked and why they didn't just quit. I have tried to quit a thousand times and can't seem to permanently. Even though I smoke I understand still how nonsmokers dislike cigarettes.

My mother still hates cigarettes and every year when I go down south with her to visit my grandmother I don't smoke in her car during the full eleven hour trip. I thought I would go completely bananas this last trip down. When we first started out I did okay. We didn't stop for around four hours. For me to go four hours without a cigarette is a miracle, especially without any really bad withdrawl symptoms. But by the time we had been on our way for close to seven hours (this was with occasional

stops where I would quickly inhale three or four cigarettes, five if I had time) it started catching up with me. I had smoked only about a third of a pack instead of my usual pack and a half by now. I was beginning to get nervous, sick to my stomach and I had the most sickening headache. It felt like my stomach was tied in knots and I had a lump in my throat that wouldn't go away.

We were about an hour away from my grandmother's when I started crying. I tried not to cry but I was so nervous and frustrated I couldn't help it. By the time we arrived at my grandmother's I felt like a nervous wreck. I didn't go in to see anyone until after I had stood outside and smoked at least five or six cigarettes. Finally, a feeling of relief replaced the tension and the headaches and nervousness had finally started going away. Even though it is hard for me to make it without cigarettes I understand that my mother doesn't like them and I can remember what it was like when I didn't smoke. I don't mind respecting the nonsmokers choice the best I can but what really gets me is that some nonsmokers try to put the smoker completely out, without a place to smoke at all.

When I attended Cleary College, smoking was permitted anywhere in the building, even the classrooms until the nonsmoking students started complaining about the cigarette smoke. So smoking was banned from the classrooms. Well, if I didn't smoke I would have complained too. That wasn't good enough, they wanted smoking banned from the lounge and the hallways too. Where were the smokers suppose to smoke? The hallways and the lounge were the only places we could smoke. At least the banning of smoking in the halls and the lounge never did go into effect.

Then there is the co-worker who complains about cigarettes and thinks everyone should quit while he is working in the building. One particular

guy where I work is, like this. He starts making fanning gestures with his hand or starts going into coughing fits. Which the coughing is obvious that they are nothing more than forced. If any of the other employees happend to be working anywhere near his work area he starts fanning his face and coughing while quickly exiting. Everyone started picking on him because he was to the point of being rude over the matter. If someone has any work to do in his area they make sure they are smoking while they do it and the workers in the department next to his make an effort to blow their cigarette smoke in his direction. He gave his two week notice the other day. Guess what his reason is for quitting. The air in the shop is unhealthy and not safe to work in. Even the nonsmokers who hate cigarettes laughed at him.

I am for the nonsmoking areas but the smokers also have to have a place to smoke. I don't want to bother anyone with my cigarettes. But I want a place where I can smoke. It's my right to smoke just like it is the nonsmokers right not to have to breathe cigarette smoke.